G. R. S. 58]

Previous references.

1892-3
191 .
(Madras)

File No. 369

Serial Nos.

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos.

Part B for

SUBJECT.

Pujaripship of the Mandagere temples in the Krishnarajpet Taluk.

(General Serial No. 30).

From

1890

To The Dy Commissioner
Mysore Dist

Dated 30 January 91
Despatched 3-2-91
Received

Enclosures No. 2 & 6.

General No. 12043
No. 697

His No 938 of the 17th ultimo forwarding the correspondence relative to the selection of a Pujari for Maudgere temples in the Hattikuppa Taluk.

—u—

The reference to the above has the honor to state that the name of a qualified person selected by all the villagers for the Pujarishipp now in question may be reported to this office together with

2

2nd

Sub Division

~~case Boyd's Estate~~

~~Sheet~~, regarding the
selection ~~which should be~~
~~made as proposed~~
by the Sub Division
Officer in para 2 of
his letter No 572 dated
2~~1st Sept 90~~ and the result
of ~~Capt Swift's report~~ held
also be reported —

2. The enclosures are
returned for reference
and resubmission.

By Order

W. H.

Secretary.

(General Serial No. 30).

1892.

From

To The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

Dated 22 March 1892

Despatched 23

Received

Enclosures No.

General No.

M No. 596

His Docket No. 647 dated 1st November 1891, stating that one Tirumalachar has been selected by the majority of the villagers as Pujari of the Kesava Devaru and Anjaneya Devaru temples at Mandagere, Krishnarajapet Taluk

---

With reference to the above has the honour to enquire whether

villagers have filed an appeal to the Chief Court and whether any decision was passed thereon. If so, a copy of the judgment together with copies of the judgments of the lower Courts may be forwarded to this office at an early date.

"By order"

[redacted]

Secret

(Before C. J. Plumer Esqr. C. J.
Chief Judge
and A. Ramachandra Iyer Esqr.
Judge.)

Karichennah & 8 others, Appellants
Defendants) &
Yellaur Pujari Dasah Respon-
dent (plaintiff)

On appeal from the court of the Sa-
bordinate Judge of Dumkur.

Exclusive possession of an idol
office of Pujari. Option of Volaries
Court's decree -

Where plaintiff sued for the exclu
sive possession of an idol and its
paraphernalia and to establish his
right to the office of Pujari (or
priest)
Held: - That the question of exclusive
possession of idol & or the office of
Pujari or the location of the idol itself
should be left to the decision of the

entitled to the sole exclusive custody of the idol &c. and the the question of locality must be decided by the volaries, we do not see how any practical effect could be given to a decree declaring plaintiff to be the pujari of the idol; & practical effect could be given to such a decree. It could only be done by forcing the services of the plaintiff as pujari on the volaries and we think that such a decree should not be passed. further we do not think that the plaintiff has shewn that he is entitled to the damages claimed or to any damages. we set aside the decree of the subordinate judge and restore that of the munsiff. The costs of the defendants in the lower Appellate court and in this court must be paid by plaintiff

for Appellant — Mr. G. Sidney Smith
for Respondent — Mr. C Veeraraghavier

Second Appeal No 77 of 84 against the decree of the Subordinate Judge of Tanjore in appeal suit No 99 of 83.

Mysore
190
6/3/92

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REG'D. N 4110 R
DATE 8-3-92

ಸಾಕ್ಷಿದಾರರ ಅಂಕಿತವಿದೆಯೆ/ಇಲ್ಲವೆ?

ಸಾಕ್ಷಿದಾರರು ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಓದಿ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ

ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿದಾರರು ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅಥವಾ ಅವರ ಹೆಬ್ಬೆರಳು ಗುರುತನ್ನು ಪಡೆದಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಸಾಕ್ಷಿದಾರರು ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಲು ಅಥವಾ ಹೆಬ್ಬೆರಳು ಗುರುತು ಒತ್ತಲು ನಿರಾಕರಿಸಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಹ ಸಂಕ್ಷಿಪ್ತವಾಗಿ ಟಿಪ್ಪಣಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ

ಸಾಕ್ಷಿದಾರರ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಓದಿ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿದಾರರು ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅಥವಾ ಅವರ ಹೆಬ್ಬೆರಳು ಗುರುತನ್ನು ಪಡೆದಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಸಾಕ್ಷಿದಾರರು ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಲು ಅಥವಾ ಹೆಬ್ಬೆರಳು ಗುರುತು ಒತ್ತಲು ನಿರಾಕರಿಸಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಹ ಸಂಕ್ಷಿಪ್ತವಾಗಿ ಟಿಪ್ಪಣಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ

ಸಾಕ್ಷಿದಾರರ ಅಂಕಿತವಿದೆಯೆ/ಇಲ್ಲವೆ?

ಸಾಕ್ಷಿದಾರರು ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಓದಿ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ

ಕಾಲಿಕ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆ

ಕಾಲಿಕ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆ

ಕಾಲಿಕ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆ

ಕಾಲಿಗೆ ಕೈಯಿಂದ ಹೊಡೆದಳು. ಕೈಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಟ್ಟೆ ಹಿಡಿದುಕೊಂಡು ಅಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಓಡಿಹೋದಳು. ಅವಳು ಹೋದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅವಳು ಹೊಡೆದ ಜಾಗವನ್ನು ಮುಟ್ಟಿಕೊಂಡು ಅಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡೆ. ಅವಳು ಹೊಡೆದ ಜಾಗ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಹೊತ್ತಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಂಪಾಗಿ ಬಾತುಕೊಂಡಿತು. ಅಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಎದ್ದು ಮನೆಯ ಒಳಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಮಲಗಿಕೊಂಡೆ. ಅಮ್ಮ ಬಂದು ಕೇಳಿದಳು. ನಾನು ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಮ್ಮ ಅಕ್ಕನನ್ನು ಬೈದಳು. ಅಕ್ಕ ಅಳುತ್ತಾ ಕುಳಿತಳು. ಅಮ್ಮ ಅಕ್ಕನಿಗೆ ಸಮಾಧಾನ ಮಾಡಿದಳು. ಅಕ್ಕ ಅಳುವುದನ್ನು ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸಿದಳು. ಅಮ್ಮ ಅಕ್ಕನಿಗೆ ಊಟ ಬಡಿಸಿದಳು. ಅಕ್ಕ ಊಟ ಮಾಡಿದಳು. ಅಮ್ಮ ಅಕ್ಕನಿಗೆ ಮಲಗಿಸಿದಳು. ಅಕ್ಕ ಮಲಗಿದಳು. ಅಮ್ಮ ಅಕ್ಕನ ತಲೆಯನ್ನು ಸವರಿದಳು. ಅಕ್ಕ ನಿದ್ದೆ ಮಾಡಿದಳು. ಅಮ್ಮ ಅಕ್ಕನ ಮುಖವನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದಳು. ಅಕ್ಕ ಎದ್ದಳು. ಅಮ್ಮ ಅಕ್ಕನಿಗೆ ಕಾಫಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಳು. ಅಕ್ಕ ಕಾಫಿ ಕುಡಿದಳು. ಅಮ್ಮ ಅಕ್ಕನಿಗೆ ಸ್ನಾನ ಮಾಡಿಸಿದಳು. ಅಕ್ಕ ಸ್ನಾನ ಮಾಡಿದಳು. ಅಮ್ಮ ಅಕ್ಕನಿಗೆ ಬಟ್ಟೆ ಹಾಕಿಸಿದಳು. ಅಕ್ಕ ಬಟ್ಟೆ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡ

ನಿಮ್ಮ ಹೆಸರು ಏನು?

ನಾನು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ನೀವು ಹೇಗಿದ್ದೀರಿ?

ನಾನು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

I received with the above is
herewith resubmitted.

Krishnaiengar
for Dy Commissioner
Mysore Dist

Compd
Clerk

16

Petn. Deptt Mar 2/4/92

(General Serial No 30.)

189



From

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore

Dated 31/3

Despatched 1/4 March

Received

Enclosures No. one

General No. 1183

No.

Transfer to Mis Mysore Branch

VC 6/4/92

With reference to his Memo no 368 dated 18 instant, forwarding for disposal petition from Krishnappa and others Gollarudegere Krishnarajpet Taluk, I have the honor to state that the papers relating to the Poojarishipp of the temple in question are pending disposal with the Government (vide this office no 647 dated 4th November 1891).

Hence the petition

193
4-4 92

9/3

17 1895. 57

Aug 74/4/55

Upstairs 9
Aug 74/ii

From

The Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

To

The ~~Chief~~ Secretary to the ~~Govt~~ of Mysore,
Govt
Muzrai Departt

Dated 30th March
Despatched 2nd April 1895
Received 4/4

Enclosures No. 1 letter; 2 files; and notes.

No. 102.

Dufjarishipsof Mandagere Temples, Krishnarajapete Taluk:—

Submits for orders a letter from the Subdy Officer regarding the —

Upstairs
a
4/4/95
Nagangla

To Munsiff, S. Pakam No. 1206/5 5/4/95

No. 18

Enclosures No.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER'S OFFIC
MYSORE DISTRICT,
Dated Mysore 30th March
2nd April

From A. Rangasami Iyengar Esqr. B.A.B.L
Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

To
The ~~Chief~~ Secretary to the ~~Dewan~~ Govt. of Mysore.
Muzrai Department.

SIR.

With reference to your docket No. 528/79, dated 15th August, 1892, regarding the Puyarship of Mandagere Temples, Krishnarajpet Taluk, I have the honor to submit herewith for Orders, French Rocks Sub Division Officer's letter No. 857, dated 11th Instant, and notes taken by Mr. Narainrow, Acting Sub Div. Officer, (in original)

From the notes it will be seen, that out of the 5 nominees of Narasimachar, mentioned in your docket quoted above, No. 1, Ranganah, is dead, and his son, Narasim is not inclined to take up Puyarishi,

Rud 9/3

archaks of Mandagere temples, as he is the Puyari of Ranganatha swami of Hemigimbetta. No. 2 Madura Narasimachar (not present) is employed as a Puyari at Kalla halli. No. 3, Boddiyachar (not present), is a resident of Burkin Kere, where he is a Puyari. No. 4, Seshachar, was absent at Dhan Kanikote, & No. 5, Narasimachar, was absent from Melkote, and could not be served with notice. Thus, the Sub Division Officer, was not able to ascertain whether parties 2 to 5 were willing to take up the duties or not. The villagers being dead opposed to their nomination, he seems to have considered it unnecessary to take further steps to procure their attendance.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most Obdt Servant.

Name
Deputy Commissioner

Compd.
Wly.

Regd. No. 442
15 3. 95

GOVERNMENT

Subdivision Office
Trenchlocks
Dated 11" March 1895

No. 857
Enc. 2 bills

From K Muhammadali Esq^r.
Subdivision Officer
Trenchlocks

Bring this up again.
AR
15/3.

15 March
AR

To The Deputy-Commissioner
Mysore District
Mysore

Sir

With reference to your docket No 319 of 7" instant regarding the Proprietorship of Mandagere Temples in the Krishnarajpet Taluk, I have the honor to state that I visited the village on the 2nd September 1892 and mustered the persons interested with the institutions

and after learning, them submitted my report No. 456 dated 16th September 1892 proposing the appointment of a Stranger to the office, as none of the nominees were acceptable to the villagers and there was a strong opposition against-anyone of them being appointed. In reply I was directed to select one amongst the five nominees who may be considered fit for the office. Thereon notices were twice issued but none appeared. And on this fact being reported to the Deputy Commissioner in memo No 5633 dated 4th February 1893 it was directed to procure the attendance of the nominees by issuing another notice and to settle the matter once for all Accordingly

notices were issued but they again failed to appear. Mr. Narain Rao having assumed charge of the Sub division he issued fresh notices made enquiries from the villagers and the nominees of Sreenivasiengar the memo of his enquiry into the case is herewith submitted From this you will find that Mr. Narain Rao concurred with my opinion and considered that a Stranger unconnected with the nominees of Sreenivasiengar had best be appointed for the good of the temples and for the sake of peace in the village From his memo I find that there are two persons Strangers unconnected with any of the nominees of Sreenivasiengar quite acceptable and against whom the villagers have no objection

The first one Doddachanny
a representative of the old Kutha
- dan Pujari family of the district
in question, and the second
the present Pujari of the
said temples. I would give
preference to the former o

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant

Sub Division Officer
French Rocks

24 Notes

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

Krishnarajpett. 5th. June 1894.

Mundigere Pujari Case.

1. Srinivasiengar, son of Narasimhachar

Present:- Villagers

1. Ramiah
2. Ramappa
3 Sankarnarniah
4. Sreecunthiah (Overseer)
5. Krishna Jois
6. Ramaswami
7. Subbaiya
8 - Gopaliah
9. Krishnappa
10. Subbiah
11. Subbarayan
12 - Hutchana Bettu
13. Sanna Hyda
14. Narasana Bettu.
15. Singri
16. Singri Bettu.
17. Karki
18 Ramanakapani

19. Agasara Kala.
20. Anjana Kapani
21. Edasi Kala.
22. Patel Kale Gowda
23. Masana Ranga
24 Venkatana Ranga
25. Kerakana Lakka
26. Sanna Thimma
27. Dyani Gowda
28. Malana Venkata
29. Giriya.
30. Kale Gowdana Sidd—
31. Marideva Bettana Bora
32. Thimmala
33. Anjana Anjeya
34. Kalasa
35. Kariya
36. Dyavana Kala

The above villagers with one voice are strongly opposed to the appointment of any one of the five persons named by Narasimha Chari. Their wish is that [illegible] Narasimha Chari

heirs (Narasimha Char being dead) or any one nominated by them or on their behalf should have attended to with the temples of Kesava devaru and Anjaneya -- They ~~are ready~~ request that an outsider may be nominated by Govt - They name the following men for selection

1. Tirumalachar, a resident of Mandagere - now doing the duties of Pujari
2. Srinivasiengar son of Ranga Pandit of Malkote.
3. Narasimha Char of Gulganjihalli in the Hole Narsipur Taluk.
4. Doddachar son of Honnenahalli Tirumalachar -

(This is the representative of the old Haldar Pujari family).

There are about 200 adult males in the village There are about 20 Brahmin families in the village - Of these 19 families

are of the Smartha Caste and only one is of the Srivaishnava Caste Only Four Smartha families side with Pujari Narasimha Chari The rest are with on the opposite side Of these four Smartha ~~families~~ the heads of two families are present.— They are indifferent as to who is appointed Pujari, but they also wish that the appointment should be made by Govt.—

The Kesavadevaru temple enjoys Inam land of the value of Rs 20 wet—

The Hanumantaraya temple has 5½ Rs. wet land & 2½ Rs. Dry. For these lands the temple pays Jodi Rs 5½

The nominees of Narasimha Chari are.

1. Naradur Narasimha Chari
2. Bukkitkere Doddaiya Chari
3. Bukkitkere Seshachari brother of No 2
4. Malkote Narasimhachar
5. Narain Bhatta, son of Bandichole Ranganna (since deceased)

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

No 1 has not appeared today
Narasimha Charys son
Srinivasaraja says No 1
is employed as Pujari at
Kalhalli -

No 2. is not present

He is a resident of Bankinkere -
Where he is a Pujari of a temple.

No. 3 is absent at Dhankanikote
not available.

No 4. is absent -. Notice could not
be served as he was absent
from Malkote -

No. 5 is absent at present. But
he had seen me in the afternoon
at the Taluk Cutcherry. He is
a resident of Bandikote -
He said he was the Pujari of
Hemagiri betada Ranganathaswami
& of Hariharpurada Kesavadevaru
He is not inclined to go to
Mandajira to take up the
Pujaribship of at Mandajira

Apart from the five men Srinivasenger has brought with him two men - viz

1. Belathur Sriniarasenger residing at Belathur in the Heggaddevankote Taluk Pays Rs45 Kandayam
   Is related to Srinivasenger
2. Krishnamachar of Kiranger in the Srirangapatna Taluk
   Is related to Srinivasenger
   Is willing to go to Mandagere
   Brother is a Pujari at Kiranger

The above mentioned 36 men ~~are~~ do not like to have any of the two men - Sriniarasenger & Krishnamachari now brought forward by Srinivasenger -

The Inam Putta is in the name of the Manager for the time being, of the Temples -

The present Pujari Sriniavachari resides in Mandagere

M Narain Rao
Sub Division Officer

5th June 1894

w 996

to Division Officer
Kind compliance
& return

Krishnarajapet
Deputy Commissioner
21/8

2. Muradari Narasimha Chari of Varadarajaswamy Kulkalli.
3. Doddiya Chari of Bukkipura.
4. Seshachari, brother of No 3.
5. Narasimhachari, son of Parthasarathy Ramanuja of Melkote Temple

29

MUZARAYI.

(General Serial No. 30.)

1892

From

The Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

Dated 15th August 1892.

Despatched

Received Rec'd Dept. 17.8.92

Enclosures No.

General No. 528
No. 79

Dept. No. 1148

His No 647 dated 4th November 1891, recommending the appointment of one Irumala chary for the Pujarship of Mandagal Temples, Krishnarajpet Talk

— " —

With reference to the above, has the honor to observe that Irumala Chary, recommended for the office of Pujari by the Sub Division Officer a having been selected

majority of the Villa is not one of
as per margin (Mowbat) whose names were submitte
Simhachari and among whom the selection was dire
to be made in the Government Proceedings No $\frac{5193}{277}$ dated
August 1890.

2 The Deputy Commissioner is requeste
to depute the Sub Division officer to proceed to
Village and of those five persons named by M
Simhachar, select the most eligible one and if
possible one who is also most acceptable to the V
and report his name to the Government without del

By Order
A Sreenivasa Co
Secretary

456 GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

Enclosure



Dated 16/17 September 1892.

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Tanjore District

To

The Secretary to Government
Public Department
Fort St. George

Sir

With reference to your memo no: 996 of 19 "Ultimo" (Received-returned) regarding the Perpetual Endowment of Vadiseeram temples, Kaisikanajapet Taluk, I have the honor to state that I went to the village on the 22nd instant and mustered the villagers mentioned in the accompanying list. Narasimhachary and two of the pupils who are his partizans were also present. None of the nominees to whom notices were duly issued were present except the 22-9,

Ramaswamah of Bandikole. The
villagers will on no account refuse
to accept any of the nominees
or any other whom Narsimha
Chary may nominate. They
seem to be determined not to
have any such but are quite
willing to accept any person
who may be nominated by
Pinnam Chetty & others connected
with Narsimha Chary and
in no way proposed by him.
There is no doubt that a very
strong feeling exists in the
village against Narsimha
Chary and the villagers are
fully determined not to
yield although they find it
to be at their cost having to
pay the value of the produce

of about ~~Rs~~ 300/- to Narasimha
charry every year under the
decree of the Court. As it is dif
ficult to ignore the right of
Narasimhacharry, it is equally
a source of regret to allow the
worship of the deity to be ne-
-glected on account of the mis
-understanding. A middle co
course is, what seems to me
to be necessary to restore the
worship. I therefore propose
that a stranger may be ap-
-pointed by Government as
Guinastie of Narasimhacharry.
Should this not meet with
the approval of the Surgery
Secretary, I shall approach
any one of the five candidates
who may appear to me to be
the best qualified, but I

sure that this will in no way
bring peace to the village or
revive the worship of the deity
as it should be.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obed.t Servant

Sub-Division Officer
Greenville Rocks

Mandigere

30

List of villagers present.

1 Subba Jois
2. Shankaranarappa
3 Narsimhiah
4 Ramaiah
5 Seeraiah
6 Krishnajois
7 Ramiah.
8. Krishnappa
9. Nagappah.
10 B. Ramiah.
11 Subbiah.
12 Gopaliah
13 Krishnappa
14 Subbiah
15 Kesaviah
16 Kala
17 Timmah
18 Timmala
19 Narasa
20 Meli
21 Kala
22 Singri
23 Ranga
24 Narasa
25 Venkata
26 Dasa
27 Kala
28 Narsa
29 Kapani

30 Kala 37
31 Linga
32 Dasa
33 Hamma
34 Bora
35 Kala
36 Chick Linga
37 Lucka
38 Cera
39 Betta
40 Poota
41 Sidda
42 Lingen Betta
43 Kalana Sidda

Narsimhachar's party

1 Seeeamiah
2 Kootcha

Muhammadh
Sub Division Officer
French Rocks

22-11

3x.

No. 439
783

17-11-92
21

30-10-92.

W 8103
689

30

45

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಆಡಳಿತ-೧೫೫ ಪಿಸಿಎಸ್

ಇವರ ಪತ್ರವ್ಯವಹಾರದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ

ಸಹ ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿಗಳು ಮಾಡಿರುವ

ಟಿಪ್ಪಣಿಯನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಸ್ಥಳ: ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು - ಅಂಚೆಪೆಟ್ಟಿ

ದಿನಾಂಕ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಮೇಲಿನ

ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಮಾಡಿದ - ಕೆಳಕಂಡಂತೆ

ವಿವರ ಬಯಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ - ಬಯಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ - ಆ

ಕೆಳಕಂಡಂತೆ ಪತ್ರ ಬರೆಯಲಾಗಿದೆ

ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ

20.10.92

435

ಸಂ 38472

2712

275

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Sub Division office
Irinjalakuda

Sub-office

ಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಫೀಸ್

ಪ್ರಿಯಾಂಕ್ ಅಪ್ಪಾಜಿ ಸ್ಟೇಷನ್ ಹೌಸ್ ಆಫೀಸರ್ ಅವರಿಗೆ

ಸಲ್ಲಿಸುವ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಏನೆಂದರೆ ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಮತ್ತು ನನ್ನ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಕೂಡಿ ಕ್ರಿಕೆಟ್ ಆಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾಗ ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬಂದ ಆರೋಪಿಗಳು ನಮ್ಮ ಜೊತೆ ಜಗಳ ತೆಗೆದು ಕೈಯಿಂದ ಹೊಡೆದು ಕಾಲಿನಿಂದ ಒದ್ದು ಕೊಲೆ ಬೆದರಿಕೆ ಹಾಕಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಆರೋಪಿಗಳ ವಿರುದ್ಧ ಕಾನೂನು ಕ್ರಮ ಜರುಗಿಸಿ ನ್ಯಾಯ ಒದಗಿಸಿಕೊಡಲು ಕೋರಿ ಈ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು

ಸಹಿ/-

ಪ್ರಿಯಾಂಕ್ ಅಪ್ಪಾಜಿ

ಸ್ಥಳ: ಚಿತ್ತಾಪುರ

ದಿನಾಂಕ: 12/12/2021

ధర్మ్యమైన పనిలో ఎలాగ కష్టపడుతూ

ఇంకా కొంతమంది ఉద్యోగులు మాకు కష్టం కాదనే

ఇంకా కొంతమంది మేము ఏమీ అనడం లేదు

కాని ఎప్పుడూ ఆలస్యంగా వస్తూ

ఉంటారు. వచ్చిన తరువాత 2 గంటలసేపు ఊరకనే

కూర్చుంటారు — ఇంకా కొంతమంది ఎప్పుడూ

కబుర్లు చెప్పుతూ ఉంటారు — వీళ్ళు

ఎప్పుడూ ఇలాగే ఉంటారు అని మేము

వీళ్ళని ఏమీ అనము — వీళ్ళు ఎప్పుడూ

కాస్త ఎక్కువ పనిచేసినట్లు కనపడరు

ఇలాంటివాళ్ళ వల్ల మా పని ఎక్కువ

అవుతుంది —

కనుక మన్యశాఖలోని ఉద్యోగులు చక్కగా పనిచేసి

ఉన్నతాధికారుల చేత మంచి అనిపించుకోవాలని

ఈ వ్యాసాన్ని ముగిస్తున్నాను

తే. 31-8-92

28.10.92

ہے۔ ۔۔۔ ہم ہم ہم

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ

ಸೇವೆಯಿಂದ ಕಡ್ಡಾಯ ನಿವೃತ್ತಿಗೊಳಿಸಿದ ಆದೇಶದ ವಿರುದ್ಧ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುವ ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಕುರಿತು.

ದಿನಾಂಕ 28-10-92 ರಂದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಆಯುಕ್ತರು ಹೊರಡಿಸಿರುವ ಆದೇಶದ ಪ್ರತಿಯನ್ನು ಲಗತ್ತಿಸಿದೆ. ಆದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವಂತೆ ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲು ಇಚ್ಛಿಸಿದಲ್ಲಿ ಆದೇಶ ಪ್ರತಿ ತಲುಪಿದ 45 ದಿನಗಳೊಳಗಾಗಿ ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಕೋರಿದೆ. ಆದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವಂತೆ ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲು ಇಚ್ಛಿಸಿದಲ್ಲಿ ಆದೇಶ ಪ್ರತಿ ತಲುಪಿದ 45 ದಿನಗಳೊಳಗಾಗಿ ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಕೋರಿದೆ. ಆದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವಂತೆ ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲು ಇಚ್ಛಿಸಿದಲ್ಲಿ ಆದೇಶ ಪ್ರತಿ ತಲುಪಿದ 45 ದಿನಗಳೊಳಗಾಗಿ ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಕೋರಿದೆ.

ದಿನಾಂಕ 345/337 ಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದು,

ہے۔ ۔ ۔

1726/1985

17139/2

5-5-93

Krishnaiah

10.5.93

Rs.
2

Sample size: 1,247 — Mean: 3.82 — Median: 3.79 — Mode: 3.75 — Range: 2.10–5.60

Standard deviation: 0.93 — Variance: 0.86 — Skewness: 0.41 — Kurtosis: 2.87

Interquartile range: 1.24 — Coefficient of variation: 24.3% — Standard error: 0.026

95% confidence interval: 3.77–3.87 — 99% confidence interval: 3.74–3.90

Pearson correlation coefficient: 0.68 — Spearman rank correlation: 0.71 — Kendall's tau: 0.52

Chi-square statistic: 14.36 — Degrees of freedom: 6 — p-value: 0.026

Cronbach's alpha: 0.89 — Intraclass correlation: 0.84 — Cohen's kappa: 0.76

Effect size (Cohen's d): 0.42 — Power (1−β): 0.81 — Minimum detectable effect: 0.18

Regression coefficient: 0.34 — Intercept: 1.12 — R^2: 0.46 — Adjusted R^2: 0.45

Durbin-Watson statistic: 1.97 — Variance inflation factor: 1.23 — Tolerance: 0.81

Akaike information criterion: 2104.6 — Bayesian information criterion: 2128.3

Log-likelihood: −1048.3 — Deviance: 2096.6 — Null deviance: 2187.4

Wald statistic: 9.21 — Likelihood ratio test: 90.8 — Score test: 88.5

Hosmer–Lemeshow statistic: 7.14 — Area under ROC curve: 0.78 — Gini coefficient: 0.56

Sensitivity: 0.74 — Specificity: 0.71 — Positive predictive value: 0.69 — Negative predictive value: 0.76

False positive rate: 0.29 — False negative rate: 0.26 — Accuracy: 0.72 — F1 score: 0.71

Matthews correlation coefficient: 0.45 — Youden's J statistic: 0.45 — Diagnostic odds ratio: 6.32

Number needed to treat: 4.2 — Relative risk: 1.38 — Odds ratio: 1.62 — Risk difference: 0.11

Kaplan–Meier median survival: 14.2 months — Log-rank test: 3.87 — Hazard ratio: 0.64

Cox proportional hazards coefficient: −0.45 — Concordance index: 0.67 — Schoenfeld residuals: 0.31

Bonferroni-corrected alpha: 0.0083 — False discovery rate: 0.12 — Benjamini–Hochberg critical value: 0.041

Shapiro–Wilk statistic: 0.983 — Kolmogorov–Smirnov statistic: 0.047 — Anderson–Darling statistic: 0.62

Levene's test statistic: 1.84 — Bartlett's test statistic: 2.07 — Fligner–Killeen statistic: 1.91

Mann–Whitney U statistic: 48213 — Wilcoxon signed-rank statistic: 31042 — Kruskal–Wallis statistic: 11.26

Friedman statistic: 9.84 — Page's L statistic: 412 — Jonckheere–Terpstra statistic: 3.17

Runs test statistic: −1.42 — Ljung–Box statistic: 18.73 — Box–Pierce statistic: 17.96

Augmented Dickey–Fuller statistic: −3.41 — Phillips–Perron statistic: −3.58 — KPSS statistic: 0.29

Granger causality F-statistic: 4.62 — Vector autoregression lag order: 4 — Impulse response: 0.18

Cointegration rank: 2 — Error correction term: −0.27 — Forecast error variance: 0.14

Autocorrelation at lag 1: 0.62 — Autocorrelation at lag 2: 0.41 — Autocorrelation at lag 3: 0.27

Partial autocorrelation at lag 1: 0.62 — Partial autocorrelation at lag 2: −0.08 — Partial autocorrelation at lag 3: 0.04

Spectral density at zero frequency: 2.31 — Periodogram peak frequency: 0.083 — Fourier coefficient: 0.19

Wavelet coefficient: 0.27 — Scaling function: 0.91 — Detail coefficient: 0.14

Principal component 1 loading: 0.71 — Principal component 2 loading: 0.58 — Principal component 3 loading: 0.39

Eigenvalue 1: 3.42 — Eigenvalue 2: 2.17 — Eigenvalue 3: 1.08 — Eigenvalue 4: 0.33

Factor loading: 0.74 — Communality: 0.61 — Uniqueness: 0.39 — Varimax rotation angle: 0.52

Discriminant function coefficient: 1.27 — Wilks' lambda: 0.64 — Canonical correlation: 0.71

Procrustes rotation residual: 0.08 — Orthogonal Procrustes distance: 0.11 — Congruence coefficient: 0.96

Multidimensional scaling stress: 0.12 — Shepard diagram correlation: 0.93 — Minimum spanning tree length: 14.7

Nearest neighbor distance: 0.23 — Voronoi cell area: 0.041 — Delaunay triangulation edge count: 3,842

Convex hull perimeter: 2.84 — Alpha shape area: 0.61 — Persistent homology Betti number: 1

Topological data analysis persistence: 0.18 — Mapper graph node count: 42 — Mapper graph edge count: 67

Kernel density estimate bandwidth: 0.15 — Support vector machine margin: 0.22 — Number of support vectors: 318

Gaussian process length scale: 1.4 — Gaussian process noise variance: 0.09 — Marginal likelihood: −412.6

Expectation–maximization iterations: 37 — Log-likelihood convergence: 1e-6 — Mixture component weight: 0.34

Hidden Markov model transition probability: 0.72 — Viterbi path log-probability: −1284.5 — Forward–backward scaling factor: 0.88

Particle filter effective sample size: 412 — Resampling threshold: 0.5 — Kalman gain: 0.31

Extended Kalman filter innovation covariance: 0.07 — Unscented transform sigma point weight: 0.167 — Ensemble Kalman filter spread: 0.24

Variational inference evidence lower bound: −1302.7 — Mean-field approximation error: 0.05 — Stochastic gradient descent learning rate: 0.001

Adam optimizer beta1: 0.9 — Adam optimizer beta2: 0.999 — Adam optimizer epsilon: 1e-8

Dropout rate: 0.2 — Batch normalization momentum: 0.99 — Layer normalization epsilon: 1e-5

Attention head count: 8 — Transformer encoder depth: 6 — Positional encoding dimension: 512

Vocabulary size: 32,000 — Byte-pair encoding merge count: 31,744 — Perplexity: 18.4

Cross-entropy loss: 2.91 — Label smoothing factor: 0.1 — Beam search width: 4

Length penalty: 0.6 — Coverage penalty: 0.2 — Repetition penalty: 1.15

Top-k sampling: 50 — Top-p sampling: 0.92 — Temperature: 0.7

Contrastive search penalty: 0.6 — Typical sampling mass: 0.95 — Eta sampling cutoff: 0.0003

Epsilon sampling cutoff: 0.0009 — Mirostat target entropy: 5.0 — Mirostat learning rate: 0.1

Guidance scale: 7.5 — Classifier-free guidance weight: 3.0 — Negative prompt embedding distance: 0.42

Image resolution: 1024×1024 — Latent dimension: 4×128×128 — Diffusion timestep count: 1000

Noise schedule beta start: 0.00085 — Noise schedule beta end: 0.012 — Variance preserving SDE coefficient: 0.5

Score matching loss: 0.034 — Denoising score matching weight: 1.0 — Langevin dynamics step size: 0.01

Euler–Maruyama step count: 50 — Heun's method step count: 25 — DPM-Solver order: 2

Consistency model distillation loss: 0.021 — Progressive distillation steps: 4 — Rectified flow straightness: 0.93

Wasserstein distance: 0.18 — Fréchet inception distance: 12.4 — Inception score: 8.7

Precision: 0.73 — Recall: 0.69 — F1 score: 0.71 — Mean average precision: 0.74

Intersection over union threshold: 0.5 — Non-maximum suppression threshold: 0.45 — Anchor box count: 9

Feature pyramid level count: 5 — Region proposal network objectness score: 0.7 — Region of interest pooling size: 7×7

Mask head resolution: 28×28 — Keypoint heatmap resolution: 56×56 — Object detection confidence threshold: 0.05

Multi-object tracking association distance: 0.3 — Kalman filter process noise: 0.01 — Kalman filter measurement noise: 0.1

Hungarian algorithm assignment cost: 0.42 — Track lifetime threshold: 30 frames — Re-identification embedding distance: 0.25

Optical flow endpoint error: 1.8 px — Structural similarity index: 0.91 — Peak signal-to-noise ratio: 32.4 dB

Learned perceptual image patch similarity: 0.08 — Video frame rate: 30 fps — Bitrate: 4.2 Mbps

Codec quantization parameter: 23 — Motion vector search range: 16 px — Intra-frame period: 60 frames

Audio sample rate: 48,000 Hz — Mel-frequency cepstral coefficient count: 13 — Short-time Fourier transform window: 2048

Hop length: 512 — Spectrogram frequency bin count: 1025 — Pitch detection confidence: 0.87

Voice activity detection threshold: 0.6 — Word error rate: 4.7% — Character error rate: 1.9%

Connectionist temporal classification blank probability: 0.12 — Language model perplexity: 42.6 — Beam search log-probability: −18.3

Speaker diarization error rate: 6.2% — Speaker embedding dimension: 256 — Cosine similarity threshold: 0.72

Text-to-speech mel-spectrogram loss: 0.41 — Vocoder upsampling factor: 256 — Prosody duration scale: 1.0

Grapheme-to-phoneme accuracy: 97.8% — Homograph disambiguation accuracy: 91.3% — Out-of-vocabulary rate: 2.4%

Named entity recognition F1: 0.88 — Part-of-speech tagging accuracy: 96.7% — Dependency parsing unlabeled attachment score: 93.1%

Coreference resolution CoNLL score: 71.4 — Semantic role labeling F1: 0.82 — Abstract meaning representation smatch: 0.79

Machine translation BLEU score: 34.6 — Chrf score: 0.61 — Translation edit rate: 0.38

Quality estimation correlation: 0.57 — Post-editing effort: 22% — Terminology consistency: 0.94

Retrieval-augmented generation recall@5: 0.86 — Dense passage retrieval embedding dimension: 768 — Reranker cross-encoder score: 0.91

Knowledge graph entity count: 1,204,000 — Relation extraction F1: 0.76 — Link prediction mean reciprocal rank: 0.33

Ontology alignment precision: 0.88 — Schema matching confidence: 0.74 — Data integration completeness: 0.97

Anomaly detection isolation forest contamination: 0.01 — One-class SVM nu: 0.05 — Local outlier factor neighbors: 20

Autoencoder reconstruction error threshold: 0.12 — Variational autoencoder KL divergence: 4.7 — Generative adversarial network discriminator loss: 0.69

Reinforcement learning reward discount factor: 0.99 — Policy gradient baseline: 0.42 — Proximal policy optimization clip ratio: 0.2

Q-learning exploration rate: 0.1 — Experience replay buffer size: 1,000,000 — Target network update interval: 10,000 steps

Multi-agent coordination success rate: 0.83 — Communication bandwidth: 256 bits — Emergent language vocabulary size: 64

Federated learning client count: 100 — Differential privacy epsilon: 8.0 — Secure aggregation overhead: 1.4×

Homomorphic encryption ciphertext expansion: 128× — Zero-knowledge proof verification time: 12 ms — Blockchain transaction throughput: 4,200 tps

Consensus latency: 2.3 s — Merkle tree depth: 20 — Hash function: SHA-256

Elliptic curve: secp256k1 — Signature scheme: ECDSA — Key derivation iterations: 600,000

Password hash: Argon2id — Memory cost: 64 MiB — Parallelism: 4 — Time cost: 3

Rate limit: 100 requests per minute — Token bucket capacity: 200 — Refill rate: 1.67 tokens per second

Circuit breaker failure threshold: 5 — Circuit breaker reset timeout: 30 s — Retry backoff: exponential, base 2

Load balancer algorithm: least connections — Health check interval: 10 s — Unhealthy threshold: 3

Service mesh sidecar memory: 128 MiB — Distributed trace sampling rate: 0.01 — Log retention: 14 days

Time series forecast horizon: 24 hours — Seasonal decomposition period: 168 hours — Trend component slope: 0.012

Exponential smoothing alpha: 0.3 — Holt-Winters beta: 0.1 — Holt-Winters gamma: 0.2

ARIMA order: (2, 1, 1) — Seasonal ARIMA order: (1, 1, 1, 24) — Model selection criterion: AIC

Cross-validation folds: 5 — Hyperparameter search trials: 200 — Bayesian optimization acquisition function: expected improvement

Grid search parameter count: 4 — Random search budget: 200 — Early stopping patience: 10 epochs

Learning rate schedule: cosine annealing — Warm restart period: 50 epochs — Gradient clipping norm: 1.0

Weight decay: 0.01 — Label smoothing: 0.1 — Mixup alpha: 0.2

Cutmix probability: 0.5 — Random erasing probability: 0.25 — Test-time augmentation views: 8

Ensemble model count: 5 — Stacking meta-learner: logistic regression — Out-of-fold prediction variance: 0.018

Calibration method: isotonic regression — Expected calibration error: 0.021 — Brier score: 0.14

Reliability diagram bin count: 15 — Conformal prediction coverage: 0.95 — Prediction interval width: 1.8

Quantile regression pinball loss: 0.27 — Monotonic constraint violations: 0 — Feature importance permutation repeats: 10

Partial dependence grid resolution: 50 — Individual conditional expectation curves: 100 — Shapley value sample count: 2,048

Local interpretable model-agnostic explanation kernel width: 0.75 — Counterfactual distance: 0.34 — Anchor precision: 0.95

Saliency map smoothing sigma: 2.0 — Integrated gradients step count: 50 — Grad-CAM layer: block5_conv3

Adversarial perturbation epsilon: 0.03 — Projected gradient descent steps: 40 — Robust accuracy: 0.61

Certified radius: 0.5 — Randomized smoothing sigma: 0.25 — Model parameter count: 7,241,318

Floating point operations per inference: 3.6 GFLOPs — Quantization bit width: 8 — Pruning sparsity: 0.5

Knowledge distillation temperature: 4.0 — Student model parameter count: 1,810,329 — Inference latency: 11 ms

Throughput: 92 images per second — Memory footprint: 412 MiB — Energy per inference: 0.8 J

Carbon intensity: 0.42 kg CO2e per kWh — Training energy: 1,240 kWh — Model card completeness: 0.96

Dataset datasheet completeness: 0.93 — Bias audit disparate impact ratio: 0.87 — Equalized odds difference: 0.04

Demographic parity difference: 0.06 — Individual fairness Lipschitz constant: 1.2 — Counterfactual fairness gap: 0.03

Differential fairness epsilon: 0.1 — Subgroup AUC minimum: 0.81 — Subgroup AUC maximum: 0.89

Intersectional fairness audit groups: 24 — Representation rate: 0.92 — Data drift detection p-value: 0.31

Concept drift detection window: 1,000 samples — Model retraining trigger threshold: 0.05 — Shadow deployment traffic fraction: 0.1

A/B test minimum detectable effect: 0.02 — A/B test power: 0.8 — A/B test significance level: 0.05

Multi-armed bandit exploration bonus: 0.1 — Thompson sampling prior alpha: 1.0 — Thompson sampling prior beta: 1.0

Contextual bandit feature dimension: 64 — Offline policy evaluation importance weight: 1.3 — Doubly robust estimator variance: 0.07

Causal forest honesty fraction: 0.5 — Causal forest minimum node size: 10 — Causal forest tree count: 2,000

Instrumental variable first-stage F-statistic: 18.4 — Two-stage least squares coefficient: 0.29 — Regression discontinuity bandwidth: 0.5

Difference-in-differences parallel trends p-value: 0.42 — Synthetic control pre-treatment RMSPE: 0.11 — Propensity score overlap: 0.91

Inverse probability weighting stabilized weight mean: 1.0 — Marginal structural model weight truncation: 0.99 — Sensitivity analysis E-value: 2.4

Bounds on unmeasured confounding: 0.18 — Negative control outcome association: 0.02 — Falsification test p-value: 0.67

Mediation analysis indirect effect: 0.12 — Proportion mediated: 0.34 — Sobel test statistic: 2.61

Bootstrap resample count: 10,000 — Bootstrap bias-corrected interval: 0.08–0.16 — Jackknife standard error: 0.021

Permutation test p-value: 0.003 — Exact test odds ratio: 1.58 — Fisher's exact p-value: 0.041

McNemar's test statistic: 4.12 — Cochran's Q statistic: 7.36 — Wilcoxon rank-sum statistic: 51,204

Kruskal–Wallis epsilon-squared: 0.06 — Jonckheere–Terpstra standardized statistic: 2.84 — Page's trend statistic: 1,318

Friedman Kendall's W: 0.31 — Nemenyi critical difference: 0.74 — Bonferroni–Dunn critical difference: 0.69

Holm–Bonferroni adjusted p-value: 0.018 — Hochberg step-up threshold: 0.025 — Benjamini–Yekutieli critical value: 0.012

Storey's q-value: 0.009 — Local false discovery rate: 0.04 — Empirical Bayes shrinkage factor: 0.72

Hierarchical model between-group variance: 0.14 — Within-group variance: 0.52 — Intraclass correlation coefficient: 0.21

Random effects standard deviation: 0.37 — Fixed effects coefficient: 0.45 — Likelihood ratio test for random effects: 12.6

Restricted maximum likelihood convergence: 1e-8 — Profile likelihood confidence interval: 0.31–0.59 — Wald confidence interval: 0.30–0.60

Bayesian credible interval: 0.32–0.58 — Posterior mean: 0.45 — Posterior standard deviation: 0.07

Markov chain Monte Carlo iterations: 20,000 — Burn-in: 5,000 — Thinning interval: 10

Gelman–Rubin statistic: 1.01 — Effective sample size: 3,842 — Autocorrelation time: 5.2

Hamiltonian Monte Carlo step size: 0.12 — Leapfrog step count: 32 — Mass matrix adaptation: diagonal

No-U-turn sampler maximum tree depth: 10 — Divergent transitions: 0 — Energy Bayesian fraction of missing information: 0.31

Prior predictive check p-value: 0.48 — Posterior predictive check p-value: 0.52 — Leave-one-out cross-validation elpd: −1,284.6

Widely applicable information criterion: 2,571.2 — Pareto-smoothed importance sampling k-hat: 0.61 — Model comparison elpd difference: 3.4

Stacking weight: 0.62 — Pseudo-BMA weight: 0.58 — Bayesian model averaging posterior probability: 0.71

Reversible-jump MCMC acceptance rate: 0.23 — Trans-dimensional move proposal: birth/death — Number of components posterior mode: 3

Dirichlet process concentration parameter: 1.0 — Stick-breaking truncation level: 20 — Chinese restaurant process table count: 7

Pitman–Yor discount parameter: 0.25 — Hierarchical Dirichlet process topic count: 42 — Latent Dirichlet allocation perplexity: 1,184

Topic coherence UMass score: −2.31 — Topic coherence NPMI score: 0.14 — Topic diversity: 0.87

Document-topic Dirichlet prior: 0.1 — Topic-word Dirichlet prior: 0.01 — Collapsed Gibbs sampling iterations: 1,000

Variational Bayes document-topic update: 0.08 — Online LDA mini-batch size: 256 — Forgetting rate: 0.7

Structural topic model prevalence covariate: 0.19 — Content covariate: 0.11 — Topic correlation limit: 0.05

Dynamic topic model drift: 0.03 — Author-topic model author count: 318 — Supervised LDA response variance: 0.42

Labeled LDA label count: 27 — Partially labeled LDA seed word count: 5 — Multi-grain LDA global topic count: 12

Hierarchical LDA tree depth: 4 — Nested Chinese restaurant process branching: 3 — Correlated topic model logistic-normal variance: 0.6

Pachinko allocation super-topic count: 8 — Sub-topic count: 64 — Word embedding dimension: 300

Skip-gram window size: 5 — Negative sampling count: 10 — Subsampling threshold: 1e-5

GloVe co-occurrence weighting exponent: 0.75 — GloVe vector dimension: 300 — Fasttext character n-gram range: 3–6

Doc2vec paragraph vector dimension: 300 — Sentence-BERT pooling: mean — Universal sentence encoder dimension: 512

Contextual word embedding layer count: 12 — Attention head dimension: 64 — Feed-forward hidden size: 3,072

Masked language model mask probability: 0.15 — Next sentence prediction accuracy: 0.97 — Whole word masking: enabled

Byte-level BPE vocabulary: 50,257 — Tokenizer maximum sequence length: 1,024 — Padding token id: 0

Beginning-of-sequence token id: 50,256 — End-of-sequence token id: 50,256 — Unknown token id: 50,256

Prompt template version: 3.2 — System message token count: 412 — Few-shot example count: 4

Chain-of-thought reasoning steps: 6 — Self-consistency sample count: 5 — Majority vote agreement: 0.78

Tool-use function call success rate: 0.91 — Retrieval-augmented generation context window: 8,192 tokens — Citation precision: 0.84

Hallucination rate: 0.06 — Refusal rate: 0.03 — Toxicity score: 0.02

Jailbreak resistance: 0.97 — Prompt injection detection recall: 0.88 — Output length mean: 312 tokens

Output length standard deviation: 187 tokens — Time to first token: 0.42 s — Tokens per second: 38

Request queue depth: 12 — Concurrent request limit: 64 — Graceful shutdown timeout: 30 s

Horizontal pod autoscaler target CPU utilization: 70% — Minimum replica count: 3 — Maximum replica count: 50

Rolling update max surge: 25% — Rolling update max unavailable: 0 — Canary traffic weight: 5%

Blue-green switch latency: 2 s — Feature flag evaluation time: 0.3 ms — Configuration reload interval: 60 s

Secret rotation interval: 90 days — Certificate expiry warning threshold: 30 days — Mutual TLS handshake time: 18 ms

Service level objective availability: 99.9% — Error budget remaining: 0.42 — Burn rate alert threshold: 2.0

Latency p50: 120 ms — Latency p95: 340 ms — Latency p99: 780 ms

Request success rate: 99.94% — Client timeout: 5 s — Server timeout: 4.5 s

Connection pool size: 32 — Idle connection timeout: 60 s — Keep-alive interval: 30 s

Database replication lag: 0.8 s — Read replica count: 2 — Write-ahead log retention: 7 days

Backup frequency: every 6 hours — Point-in-time recovery window: 14 days — Restore test success rate: 1.0

Schema migration duration: 4 min — Index build concurrency: 4 — Vacuum threshold: 0.2

Cache hit ratio: 0.87 — Cache eviction policy: least recently used — Cache warm-up duration: 90 s

Content delivery network edge count: 180 — Origin shield enabled: yes — Static asset cache TTL: 86,400 s

Gzip compression level: 6 — Brotli compression level: 4 — Response header count: 14

Cookie size: 412 bytes — Session store: Redis cluster — Session TTL: 1,800 s

Rate limit burst allowance: 50 — Geographic restriction: 3 countries blocked — Bot detection score threshold: 0.9

Web application firewall rule count: 212 — Request body size limit: 10 MiB — Header size limit: 8 KiB

Content security policy: strict-dynamic — Subresource integrity: enabled — Referrer policy: strict-origin-when-cross-origin

Permissions policy: camera=(), microphone=(), geolocation=() — Cross-origin resource sharing: restricted — Preflight cache duration: 600 s

Server-sent events heartbeat interval: 15 s — WebSocket ping interval: 30 s — Maximum frame size: 1 MiB

Compression ratio: 3.4× — Uncompressed payload: 1.2 MB — Compressed payload: 352 KB

Time to interactive: 2.1 s — First contentful paint: 0.9 s — Cumulative layout shift: 0.04

Largest contentful paint: 1.6 s — First input delay: 12 ms — Total blocking time: 180 ms

Lighthouse performance score: 94 — Accessibility score: 98 — Best practices score: 100

Search engine optimization score: 92 — Progressive web app installability: yes — Offline capability: yes

Service worker cache strategy: stale-while-revalidate — Precache manifest entry count: 47 — Runtime cache entry limit: 200

Push notification subscription count: 1,842 — Push notification delivery rate: 0.91 — Background sync queue depth: 3

Geolocation accuracy: 12 m — Camera resolution: 1920×1080 — Microphone sample rate: 44,100 Hz

Battery level threshold: 0.2 — Device memory: 8 GB — Hardware concurrency: 8 cores

Screen orientation: portrait-primary — Touch points: 5 — Pointer type: coarse

Color gamut: sRGB — Dark mode preference: respected — Reduced motion preference: respected

Font loading strategy: swap — Variable font axes: 3 — Font subset size: 42 KB

Image format: AVIF with WebP fallback — Lazy loading threshold: 200 px — Responsive image breakpoints: 5

Device pixel ratio: 2.0 — Viewport width: 390 px — Viewport height: 844 px

Safe area inset top: 47 px — Safe area inset bottom: 34 px — Notch detection: enabled

Haptic feedback intensity: medium — Vibration pattern duration: 10 ms — Gesture recognition: swipe, pinch, long-press

Drag-and-drop file count limit: 10 — Clipboard read permission: prompted — Share target: enabled

Web Bluetooth: disabled — Web USB: disabled — Web NFC: disabled

Payment request API: enabled — Supported payment methods: 4 — Checkout abandonment rate: 0.31

Conversion rate: 0.042 — Average order value: 38.50 — Customer lifetime value: 214.00

Net promoter score: 41 — Customer satisfaction score: 4.3 — Support ticket volume: 1,240 per month

First response time: 2.4 h — Resolution time: 18 h — Escalation rate: 0.07

Knowledge base article count: 312 — Self-service deflection rate: 0.58 — Chatbot containment rate: 0.64

Agent handle time: 11 min — Queue abandonment rate: 0.09 — Service level agreement compliance: 0.96

Quality assurance score: 92 — Calibration session count: 4 per month — Inter-rater reliability: 0.88

Training hours per agent: 40 — Onboarding duration: 6 weeks — Attrition rate: 0.18

Workforce management forecast accuracy: 0.93 — Shrinkage: 0.27 — Occupancy: 0.82

Schedule adherence: 0.95 — Overtime hours: 120 per month — Absenteeism rate: 0.04

Employee engagement score: 4.1 — Pulse survey response rate: 0.71 — Exit interview count: 9 per month

Recruitment pipeline size: 47 — Time to hire: 34 days — Offer acceptance rate: 0.78

Diversity hiring ratio: 0.42 — Internal mobility rate: 0.12 — Promotion rate: 0.09

Performance review cycle: annual — Goal completion rate: 0.86 — Peer feedback count: 3 per employee

Compensation band count: 12 — Salary range spread: 0.4 — Bonus payout ratio: 0.11

Equity grant vesting schedule: 4 years — Cliff period: 1 year — Benefits enrollment rate: 0.97

Parental leave duration: 16 weeks — Remote work days: 3 per week — Office occupancy: 0.55

Commute time: 28 min — Carbon footprint per employee: 4.2 t CO2e — Sustainability score: 72

Waste diversion rate: 0.68 — Water usage: 1,200 m³ per month — Renewable energy share: 0.35

Green building certification: LEED Gold — Energy use intensity: 180 kWh/m² — Lighting power density: 8 W/m²

HVAC setpoint: 21 °C — Humidity setpoint: 45% — Air changes per hour: 6

Indoor air quality index: 42 — Volatile organic compound concentration: 0.3 mg/m³ — Particulate matter PM2.5: 8 µg/m³

Noise level: 52 dB — Daylight factor: 2.5% — Window-to-wall ratio: 0.4

Thermal comfort predicted mean vote: 0.1 — Predicted percentage dissatisfied: 0.05 — Adaptive comfort range: 19–24 °C

Elevator wait time: 45 s — Escalator capacity: 4,000 persons per hour — Parking occupancy: 0.72

Electric vehicle charging stations: 24 — Bicycle parking spaces: 120 — Public transit distance: 0.4 km

Walkability score: 88 — Bikeability score: 76 — Transit score: 91

Fleet vehicle count: 18 — Fleet fuel consumption: 2,400 L per month — Fleet emissions: 6.1 t CO2e

Route optimization savings: 0.12 — Delivery success rate: 0.97 — Last-mile cost: 3.40 per delivery

Warehouse pick rate: 120 lines per hour — Inventory turnover: 6.2 — Stockout rate: 0.02

Safety stock days: 14 — Reorder point: 320 units — Economic order quantity: 1,500 units

Supplier lead time: 21 days — Supplier on-time delivery: 0.91 — Supplier defect rate: 0.004

Purchase order cycle time: 5 days — Three-way match exception rate: 0.06 — Invoice processing time: 2 days

Accounts payable aging: 38 days — Accounts receivable aging: 42 days — Days sales outstanding: 41

Working capital: 1,250,000 — Current ratio: 1.8 — Quick ratio: 1.1

Debt-to-equity ratio: 0.6 — Interest coverage ratio: 4.2 — Return on assets: 0.07

Return on equity: 0.14 — Gross margin: 0.38 — Operating margin: 0.12

Net profit margin: 0.08 — Earnings per share: 2.40 — Price-to-earnings ratio: 16.5

Dividend yield: 0.03 — Payout ratio: 0.45 — Retention ratio: 0.55

Sustainable growth rate: 0.08 — Internal rate of return: 0.11 — Net present value: 340,000

Payback period: 3.2 years — Discounted cash flow: 1,120,000 — Weighted average cost of capital: 0.09

Capital asset pricing model beta: 1.1 — Risk-free rate: 0.04 — Market risk premium: 0.06

Value at risk: 120,000 — Conditional value at risk: 165,000 — Stress test loss: 410,000

Scenario analysis probability: 0.15 — Monte Carlo simulation runs: 10,000 — Sensitivity to interest rate: −0.8

Sensitivity to commodity price: 0.3 — Sensitivity to foreign exchange: 0.5 — Hedge ratio: 0.6

Derivative notional: 2,000,000 — Mark-to-market gain: 18,000 — Collateral posted: 250,000

Counterparty credit rating: A− — Probability of default: 0.012 — Loss given default: 0.45

Exposure at default: 1,800,000 — Expected loss: 9,720 — Unexpected loss: 41,000

Economic capital: 320,000 — Regulatory capital ratio: 0.14 — Liquidity coverage ratio: 1.3

Net stable funding ratio: 1.1 — Leverage ratio: 0.07 — Tier 1 capital: 2,400,000

Tier 2 capital: 600,000 — Risk-weighted assets: 18,000,000 — Capital adequacy ratio: 0.16

Stress capital buffer: 0.025 — Countercyclical buffer: 0.01 — Systemic risk buffer: 0.02

Total loss-absorbing capacity: 0.21 — Minimum requirement for own funds and eligible liabilities: 0.18 — Resolution plan update cycle: annual

Recovery plan trigger: 0.12 — Living will submission: annual — Intercompany exposure limit: 0.25

Related party transaction: 0.03 — Arm's length deviation: 0.02 — Transfer pricing adjustment: 0.01

Tax rate: 0.21 — Effective tax rate: 0.19 — Deferred tax asset: 340,000

Deferred tax liability: 210,000 — Net operating loss carryforward: 1,200,000 — Tax credit: 45,000

Audit fee: 180,000 — Non-audit fee: 60,000 — Internal audit coverage: 0.85

Control deficiency count: 3 — Material weakness: 0 — Significant deficiency: 1

Remediation plan completion: 0.67 — Whistleblower report count: 4 — Investigation duration: 21 days

Code of conduct training completion: 0.98 — Anti-bribery training completion: 0.96 — Gift and entertainment log entries: 112

Conflict of interest disclosure: 0.94 — Political contribution: 0 — Charitable donation: 25,000

Volunteer hours: 320 — Community investment: 0.005 of revenue — Supplier diversity spend: 0.12

Modern slavery statement: published — Human rights due diligence: annual — Grievance mechanism: operational

Water stewardship: basin-level plan — Biodiversity impact assessment: completed — Deforestation-free sourcing: 0.88

Circular economy: 0.31 — Product take-back: 0.14 — Recycled content: 0.22

Packaging reduction: 0.09 — Single-use plastic: 0.04 — Refillable format: 0.18

Life cycle assessment: cradle-to-gate — Functional unit: 1 kg — Allocation method: economic

Impact category: global warming potential — Characterization factor: 1.0 — Normalization reference: 2010

Weighting set: equal — Single score: 0.42 — Eco-indicator: 99

Environmental product declaration: third-party verified — Product category rule: ISO 14025 — Declaration validity: 5 years

Carbon offset: 1,000 t CO2e — Offset vintage: 2021–2023 — Offset registry: Verra

Additionality: demonstrated — Permanence buffer: 0.2 — Leakage: 0.05

Net zero target year: 2050 — Science-based target: 1.5 °C aligned — Interim target year: 2030

Scope 1 emissions: 4,200 t CO2e — Scope 2 emissions: 2,100 t CO2e — Scope 3 emissions: 18,000 t CO2e

Scope 3 category 1: purchased goods — Scope 3 category 4: upstream transport — Scope 3 category 11: use of sold products

Scope 3 category 15: investments — Materiality threshold: 0.01 — Boundary: operational control

Base year: 2019 — Base year emissions: 26,300 t CO2e — Reduction achieved: 0.23

Intensity metric: 0.0004 t CO2e per unit — Renewable electricity procurement: 0.35 — Power purchase agreement: 120 MW

On-site generation: 2.4 MW — Battery storage: 1.2 MWh — Demand response: enrolled

Grid emission factor: 0.42 kg CO2e per kWh — Market-based factor: 0.31 kg CO2e per kWh — Location-based factor: 0.42 kg CO2e per kWh

Refrigerant leakage: 0.8 t CO2e — Fugitive emissions: 0.3 t CO2e — Process emissions: 1,100 t CO2e

Combustion emissions: 3,100 t CO2e — Mobile combustion: 1,100 t CO2e — Stationary combustion: 2,000 t CO2e

Business travel: 1,400 t CO2e — Employee commuting: 900 t CO2e — Waste generated: 210 t CO2e

Upstream leased assets: 340 t CO2e — Downstream leased assets: 120 t CO2e — Franchises: not applicable

Processing of sold products: 2,600 t CO2e — End-of-life treatment: 1,800 t CO2e — Capital goods: 4,500 t CO2e

Fuel- and energy-related activities: 1,900 t CO2e — Data quality score: 2.1 — Primary data coverage: 0.42

Supplier engagement: 0.55 — Supplier emissions reduction target: 0.25 — Supplier CDP response rate: 0.61

Internal carbon price: 85 per t CO2e — Shadow price: 120 per t CO2e — Carbon tax exposure: 0.4 of profit

Emissions trading scheme: EU ETS — Allowance surrender: 1,200 t CO2e — Free allocation: 0.6

Cap-and-trade compliance: met — Offset quality score: 0.78 — Nature-based offset: 0.7

Technology-based offset: 0.3 — Co-benefits: biodiversity, livelihoods — Permanence risk: low

Reversal risk: 0.1 — Monitoring frequency: annual — Third-party verification: annual

Assurance level: limited — Assurance standard: ISAE 3410 — Materiality: 5% of emissions

Restatement: 0 — Boundary change: 0 — Methodology change: 0

Uncertainty: ±5% — Sensitivity analysis: completed — Scenario: 1.5 °C pathway

Transition risk: medium — Physical risk: low — Climate opportunity: 0.12 of revenue

Task force on climate-related financial disclosures: aligned — Governance: board oversight — Strategy: resilience tested

Risk management: integrated — Metrics and targets: disclosed — Forward-looking statements: 0.4

Climate scenario: 2 °C — Time horizon: 2050 — Asset stranding: 0.08

Revenue at risk: 0.15 — Capital expenditure: 0.06 of revenue — Research and development: 0.04 of revenue

Green bond issuance: 500,000,000 — Sustainability-linked loan: 300,000,000 — Coupon step-up: 0.25%

Use of proceeds: eligible projects — Allocation report: annual — Impact report: annual

Second party opinion: obtained — Green bond principles: aligned — Taxonomy alignment: 0.62

Do no significant harm: assessed — Minimum safeguards: met — Technical screening criteria: met

Substantial contribution: climate change mitigation — Activity: manufacturing — Eligible revenue: 0.71

Eligible capital expenditure: 0.68 — Eligible operating expenditure: 0.55 — Aligned revenue: 0.44

Aligned capital expenditure: 0.39 — Aligned operating expenditure: 0.31 — Transitional activity: 0.12

Enabling activity: 0.08 — Not eligible: 0.29 — Not aligned: 0.56

Disclosure delegated act: applied — Article 8 reporting: completed — Key performance indicator: 0.44

Capital expenditure plan: 0.52 — Operating expenditure plan: 0.48 — Locked-in emissions: 0.31

Stranded asset: 0.09 — Just transition: assessed — Social taxonomy: under development

Minimum safeguards: met — Controversial weapons: excluded — Tobacco: excluded

Coal: excluded — Oil and gas: excluded — Nuclear: included

Gas: included — Fossil fuel lock-in: 0.18 — Transition finance: 0.22

Blended finance: 0.15 — Concessional finance: 0.08 — Development finance: 0.12

Private capital mobilized: 0.35 — Public capital: 0.65 — Leverage: 3.2

Guarantee: 0.1 — First-loss tranche: 0.05 — Junior tranche: 0.15

Mezzanine tranche: 0.2 — Senior tranche: 0.6 — Investment grade: BBB−

Credit enhancement: 0.12 — Liquidity facility: 0.08 — Currency hedge: 0.5

Interest rate swap: 0.3 — Cross-currency swap: 0.2 — Basis risk: 0.04

Prepayment risk: 0.06 — Extension risk: 0.03 — Duration: 7.2 years

Convexity: 0.8 — Yield to maturity: 0.045 — Spread over benchmark: 0.012

Option-adjusted spread: 0.011 — Z-spread: 0.013 — Asset swap spread: 0.014

Credit default swap spread: 0.009 — Implied volatility: 0.22 — Realized volatility: 0.19

Volatility risk premium: 0.03 — Skew: −0.4 — Kurtosis: 3.6

Tail risk hedge: 0.02 — Portfolio insurance: 0.05 — Dynamic hedging: 0.1

Rebalancing frequency: monthly — Turnover: 0.18 — Transaction cost: 0.0008

Bid-ask spread: 0.0004 — Market impact: 0.0012 — Slippage: 0.0005

Execution shortfall: 0.0009 — Implementation shortfall: 0.0011 — Arrival price: 142.30

Volume-weighted average price: 142.18 — Time-weighted average price: 142.21 — Participation rate: 0.1

Dark pool fill rate: 0.34 — Lit market fill rate: 0.66 — Order-to-trade ratio: 4.2

Message rate: 1,200 per second — Latency to exchange: 0.8 ms — Co-location: enabled

Direct market access: enabled — Algorithmic trading: 0.72 — High-frequency trading: 0.41

Market maker: 0.18 — Liquidity provider: 0.23 — Taker: 0.59

Maker rebate: 0.0002 — Taker fee: 0.0003 — Net fee: 0.0001

Clearing: central

ﻣﺎﺭﺳﻴﻠﻴﺎ ﺍﻟﻤﺘﺤﺪﺓ ﺍﻟﻤﺘﺤﺪﺓ ﺍﻟﻤﺘﺤﺪﺓ

ولا يجوز أن يكون الشرط مخالفاً لمقتضى العقد، ولا مناقضاً لمقصوده، ولا مخالفاً لنص شرعي، ولا مؤدياً إلى جهالة تفضي إلى النزاع، ولا مؤدياً إلى الربا، ولا مؤدياً إلى الغرر، ولا مؤدياً إلى الضرر، ولا مؤدياً إلى أكل أموال الناس بالباطل، ولا مؤدياً إلى الظلم، ولا مؤدياً إلى الفساد في الأرض، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالنظام العام، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالآداب العامة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالأمن العام، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالسلم العام، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالصحة العامة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالبيئة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالموارد الطبيعية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالتراث الثقافي، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالتنوع البيولوجي، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالتوازن البيئي، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالتنمية المستدامة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المكتسبة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالمراكز القانونية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالثقة المشروعة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالعدالة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالمساواة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحرية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالكرامة الإنسانية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الأساسية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الدستورية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق القانونية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الشرعية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الطبيعية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المدنية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق السياسية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الاقتصادية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الاجتماعية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الثقافية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق البيئية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الرقمية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المعلوماتية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق التكنولوجية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق العلمية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الفنية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الأدبية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الصناعية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق التجارية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المالية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المصرفية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق التأمينية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق العقارية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المنقولة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المعنوية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المادية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الشخصية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق العينية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق التبعية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الأصلية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الفرعية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المشتركة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتبادلة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتقابلة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتكافئة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتوازنة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتناسبة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتعادلة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتساوية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتماثلة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتشابهة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتطابقة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتجانسة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتناسقة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتناغمة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتوافقة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتلائمة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتكاملة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتعاونة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتضامنة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتآزرة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتساندة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتعاضدة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتكافلة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتآخية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتحابة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتصافية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتسامحة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتراحمة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتعاطفة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتوادة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتصالحة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتسالمة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتعايشة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتجاورة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتقاربة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتداخلة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتشابكة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتعانقة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتلاحمة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتماسكة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتينة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الراسخة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الثابتة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المستقرة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المطمئنة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الآمنة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المحمية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المصونة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المكفولة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المضمونة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المرعية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المحترمة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المقدسة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المعظمة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المبجلة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المكرمة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المشرفة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الرفيعة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق السامية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق العالية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الشامخة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الباسقة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الوارفة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الظليلة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الندية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الطيبة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الزكية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق العطرة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الفواحة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الشذية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق العبقة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الأريجة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الزاكية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الطاهرة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق النقية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الصافية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الخالصة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المحضة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الأصيلة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق العريقة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق التليدة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الموروثة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المكتسبة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المستحقة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الواجبة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق اللازمة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الملزمة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الجبرية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق القهرية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الإلزامية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الوجوبية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الحتمية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق القطعية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق اليقينية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الجازمة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الفاصلة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الحاسمة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق النهائية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الأبدية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق السرمدية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الخالدة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الباقية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الدائمة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المستمرة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتواصلة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتتابعة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتعاقبة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتلاحقة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتوالية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتسلسلة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتراتبة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتدرجة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتصاعدة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتنامية، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتزايدة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتعاظمة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتكاثرة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتضاعفة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتكاثفة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتراكمة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتجمعة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتحدة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق الموحدة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المجتمعة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتآلفة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتحدة، ولا مؤدياً إلى الإخلال بالحقوق المتوحد

11683

936 899

1068
1119

5525

127/

Assembly

Bring up

28/4/95

reference

W 10682

5-6-96

1012

13361

C 918
1150

30/5/94

నా పేరు

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

13361

[illegible]

2-6-

[illegible]

[illegible]

ప్రేంజు రాజ్యు నాగరిం మాంతి ఆశ్రయాలు—

శ్రీలంక శ్రీమతి రాజపక్సే రాంలాంఛనాలతో అ శ్రీ కేవాన్ని
ఆయన శ్రీమాంగళ్య సాంతరీక్షంలో ప్రశాంతంగా విశ్రమించారు
అనేకానేక రంగాల్లో ఆమె చేసిన సేవలు మరువలేనివి
ఆమె ఆత్మకు శాంతి చేకూరాలని ప్రార్థిస్తున్నాం

రాందర్ శ్రీ తన కాశ్మీర్ పర్యటనలో ఉన్నప్పుడు ఆ వార్త
విని చలించిపోయారు. ఆమె మృతి తీరనిలోటు అని
సంతాపం వ్యక్తం చేశారు. ఆమె కుటుంబ సభ్యులకు
ప్రగాఢ సానుభూతి తెలియజేశారు.

30/5/19 చెన్నై

ఆంజనేయులు

2-6-

నా పేరు —

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

85

(General Serial No. 30.)

1893.

From The Munsiff in Mysore

To The Munsiff Gerangapatam

Dated 31st ~~January~~ Feby /93

Despatched 2nd Feby

Received

Enclosures No. Nil

General No. 428

No

This office yadi No. 3 dated 2nd Septr /92 forwarding the file of papers connected with Anjaneya and Chennakesava Swami temples at Nandagere, Tiristiarajapet Taluk.

—— " ——

~~With reference to the above~~ I have the honour to request that the papers ~~files~~ forwarded to him with the above may be returned to this office if they are no longer

ನಂ
818.

ಸೈ ಸ್ಟಂ ಪ ಪಂ ಸ್ಟ್ರೈ ಪ ಪ ಸೈ ಸ್ಟೂ ಂ ಪ ಪ ಂ ಸ್ಟ್ರ್.

ಪ ಚ್ಚಿ ಂ ಪ ಪ ಸ್ಟಂ ಯ ಯ ಲ್ಲಂ ಚ್ಚಿ ಯ ಂ ಪ್ರಾ ಂ

ಸ್ಟ್ರೈ ಪ ಂ ಪ ಪ ಪ್ಪ ಮ್ಮ ಪ್ಪ ಸೈ ಸ್ಟಂ ಂ ಪ ಪ ಪ್ಪ ಸ್ಟ್ರೈ ಪ್ಪ ಪ್ಪ ಪ್ಪ.
ಪ್ರಾ ಗೆ

ಸ್ಟ್ರೈ ಸ್ಟ್ಲಾ ಂ ಚ ಚ್ಚಿ ಚ್ಚಿ ಶ್ಚ ಸ್ಟೂ ಂ ಚ ಲ ಮಂ

ಪ ಳ ಚಿ ಸ್ಟ್ರಾ ಮ ಪ ಪ್ಪ ಂ ಚ ಳ್ಚಿ ಂ ಯ ಸ್ಟ್ರಾ ಲ - ಮ ಪ್ಪ ಚ್ಚ

ಸೈ ಸ್ಟಿ ಂ ಶ ಪ ಸ್ಟ್ರಾ ಲ ಪ ಸ್ಟಿ ಂ ಪ ಸ್ಟ್ರಿ ಪ ಪ ಂ ಸ್ಟ ಯ ಪ ಸ್ಟ್ಲಿ ಪ ಪ

ಂ ಪ ಳ ಪ ಪ ಪ ಳ್ಚಿ ಂ ಸ್ಟ್ರಿ ಚ್ಚಿ ಸೈ ಸ್ಟಿ ಂ ಂ ಶ ಪ್ಪ ಲ ಳ್ಚಿ ಂ

ಸೈ ಸ್ಟಿ ಂ ಚ್ಚಿ ಂ ಪ್ಪ ಮ್ಮ ಪ್ಪ ಂ ಳ 1892 ಯ ಪ ಂ ಸ್ಟಿ ಸ್ಟ್ರಂ

ಲ ಳ್ಚಿ ಸ್ಟ್ರಿ ಮ ಪ್ಪ ಸ್ಟೂ ಂ ಸ್ಟಿ ಳ ಂ ಲ್ಲಿ ಪ ಪ ಪ ಳ್ಳು ಸ

ಳ ಪ್ಪ ಚ್ಚಿ ಯ ಪ್ಪ ಳ ಸ್ಟ್ರಿ. ಪ ಪ ಂ ಂ ಸ್ಟ್ರ್ ಯ ಪ್ಪ ಪ ಂ ಸ್ಟ್ರಾ

ಂ ಪ ಳ್ಚಿ ಲ ಂ ಪ ಸ್ಟಿ ಪ ಪ್ಪ ಸ್ಟಂ ಂ ಪ ಳ್ಚಿ ಪ ಂ ಸ್ಟ್ರಿ ಂ ಸ್ಟ್ರಿ

ಂ ಪ ಳ್ಚಿ ಸ್ಟ್ರಿ ಳ ಳ್ಳು ಸ ಳ್ಚಿ ಂ ಸ್ಟ್ರಿ.

By order

Secretary

27—5—93
ಸೈ ಸ್ಟಂ ಲ

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF MUSEUM
* IN MYSORE *

ನಂ
818

By order
Secretary

27—5—93

Rec'd 9/6/93

1109

7219

6-6-93

A1

Gen. Serial No. 30.]

189

MUZARAI.

From

The Secretary to the
Dewan of Mysore.

To The Dy Commr
Mysore Distt

Dated 2 March/95

Despatched 4

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 769
Muzarai F. No.

This office No 5-28-79
Dated 13th Augt/92
requesting to be furnished with certain information regarding the Pujarishipof 2 temples Mandagere in the Krishnarajapet Taluk

—"—

Has the honor to request an early reply

the same No 1027 of 30/3/95

M.G.G.P.L.—21 6 94—1,000

91 reply to the above

Very cordy

A H

Secretary.

by

To 92

312 & 28-8-95

The Registrar
Chief Court
Bangalore.

Sir.

In ~~August~~ September 1892, the Curtis Murrai records relating to the Pujariship of Anjaneya and Kesava Devaru temples ~~at~~ in Mandagere, Krishnarajpet Taluk, were sent to the Munsiffs Court at Sreerangapatam on a requisition from that court that the papers were required for reference in connection with a Civil Suit filed by the Pujari of the temples against one Ramayya and certain other residents of the village. In reply to a reference from this office requesting the return of the records, the Munsiff has in his ~~letter~~ [illegible]

2383 dated 15th April 1895 reported that the papers in question had been submitted to the Mysore Sub-Judge's Court in connection with an appeal filed against his decision; and since it has also been ascertained that the same records have been submitted to the Chief Court in connection with a second appeal, no 66 of 1894-5, against the Sub-Judge's decision

a3

2 I am now directed to inform you that ~~a reference~~ an appeal about the Pujaridhip of the temple has long been pending before ~~the~~ Government; and as the question could not be disposed of without the ~~records~~ records above referred to, I am to request that you will be so good as to return the ~~records~~ same direct to this office soon after the second appeal is disposed

of by the Chief Court.

I have the

Secretary

Asst